UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/724,668	12/01/2003	Akiyo Nadamoto	43521-1500	2404

21611   7590   11/24/2009
SNELL & WILMER LLP (OC)
600 ANTON BOULEVARD
SUITE 1400
COSTA MESA, CA 92626

EXAMINER
BULLOCK, JOSHUA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2162	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/24/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>14 July 2009</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-19</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-16 and 18</u> is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) <u>17 and 19</u> is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is in response to amendments and arguments/remarks filed on July

14, 2009, in which claims 1-19 are presented for further examination.

2.   Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 10-13, & 15 have been amended.

3.   Claims 17-19 are new.

4.   Claims 1-19 are pending.

Response to Arguments

5.   Applicant's arguments filed July 14, 2009 have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive. See Examiner's response below.

6.   With respect to applicant's argument in association with claim1, applicant asserts

that Donker does not teach or suggest "a web page display control portion that displays

the similar web pages specified by the similar web page finding portion together with the

basic web page and synchronized with an operation to the basic web page. Examiner

respectfully disagrees. Given the broadest reasonable interpretation Donker teaches

(column 2, lines 12-16) display of alternate web pages with the desired web page,

wherein the alternate web page is a "similar web page" and the desired web page is a

"basic web page". Donker goes further to teach (column 3, lines 62-67, column 4, lines

1-4) dynamic or automatic display of similar web pages which are in sync with the

desired web page.

7.   With respect to applicant's argument in association with claim 8, applicant

asserts that Donker does not teach or suggest "wherein the web page display control

portion displays the basic web page and the similar web page on a same window".

Examiner respectfully disagrees and maintains his position with respect to the same.

Given the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claim language as recited, Donker

teaches (column 4, lines 60-66) display of a desired web page along with an alternative

web page.

8.   With respect to applicant's argument in association with claim 10, applicant

asserts that Donker does not teach or suggest "wherein the web page display control

portion displays a word in the similar web page that is the same as a word that is

selected in the basic web page in a mode different from other words out of the similar

web page". Examiner respectfully disagrees. Donker teaches (column 8, lines 51-67)

cached copies on web pages which includes keywords (column 6, lines 56-61), wherein

a cached copy is representative of a different mode than the original.

9.   With respect to applicant's argument in association with claim 11, applicant

asserts that Donker fails to disclose "a difference web page finding portion that specifies

a difference web page as a web page having difference information that is contained in

the basic web page and that is not contained in the similar web page from the compared

web site. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Given the broadest reasonable

interpretation, Donker teaches (column 3, lines 50-61) an alternative web page is a

"difference web page having difference information" wherein it is clear that alternative

web pages are not identical web pages therefore having different information.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

10.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

11.   Claims 1 & 6-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over

Donker et al. (US Patent No. 7,219,162 B2), hereinafter referred to as Donker.

As per Claim 1, Donker teaches:

- **a content synchronization system of similar Web pages** (column 1, lines 17-20, column 6, lines 5-11 & 31-34) **comprising: a basic Web page specify portion that receives an identifier of a basic Web page as a Web page to be a basis of display and specifies the basic Web page** (Donker teaches (column 5, lines 45-50) an URL for a webpage which serves as an identifier of a basic webpage.)

- **a compared Web site specify portion that receives an identifier of a compared Web site as a compared object of the basic Web page and specifies the compared Web page** (Donker teaches (column 5, lines 45-50, column 6, lines 51-55) URL identifiers of webpages including both compared and similar web pages.)

- **a keyword extract portion that extracts a keyword in the basic Web page specified by the basic Web page specify portion** (Donker teaches (column 6, lines 56-58) keywords associated with webpages.)

- **a similar Web page finding portion that specifies one or multiple similar Web pages that are similar to an entire part or a part of the basic Web page in the compared Web sites based on the keyword extracted by the keyword extract portion** (Donker teaches (column 6, lines 51-61) locating similar web pages to a compared webpage based on keywords associated with both pages.)

- **a Web page display control portion that displays the similar Web pages specified by the similar Web page finding portion together with the basic Web page and synchronized with an operation to the basic Web page** (Donker teaches (column 2, lines 12-16) display of webpages.)

As per Claim 6, Donker teaches:

- **the similar Web page finding portion considers a Web page that is the most similar to the basic Web page among the compared Web pages as the similar Web page** (Donker teaches (column 2, lines 21-25) locating the most relevant webpage of an initially located webpage.)

As per Claim 7, Donker teaches:

- **the similar Web page finding portion considers a paragraph from the compared web page that contains keywords over a**

predetermined number as a similar paragraph, and considers a

compared Web page with a largest number of paragraphs judged

as the similar paragraph, as the similar Web page (Donker teaches

(column 6, lines 51-61) a similar Web page finding portion that compares

keywords from paragraphs of the compared Web page and the similar

Web page.)

As per Claim 8, Donker teaches:

-        **the Web page display control portion displays the basic Web page**

and the similar Web page on a same window (Donker teaches

(column 2, lines 12-16) display of webpages.)

As per Claim 9, Donker teaches:

-        **the Web page display control portion displays a part of the similar**

Web page that is similar to the part displayed out of the basic Web

page (Donker teaches (column 2, lines 12-16) display of webpages.)

As per Claim 10, Donker teaches:

-        **the Web page display control portion displays a word in the similar**

web page that is the same as a word that is selected in the basic

Web page in a mode different from other words in the similar Web

page (column 6, lines 51-61)

As per Claim 11, Donker teaches:

-        **a difference Web page finding portion that specifies a difference**

Web page as a Web page having difference information that is

contained in the basic Web page and that is not contained in the

similar Web page from the compared Web site and a difference

Web page display portion that makes it possible to display one or

multiple difference Web pages specified by the difference Web

page finding portion together with the basic Web page and the

similar Web page simultaneously (Donker teaches (column 1, lines

17-20) locating of different web pages and display thereof, wherein the

different web pages has different information.)

As per Claim 12, Donker teaches:

- **the difference Web page display portion displays the difference**

   Web page in a form of an icon and the difference Web page is

   displayed by a predetermined operation applied to the icon (Donker

   teaches (column 2, lines 12-16) links for different webpages, wherein

   these links are icons.)

In respect to Claim 13, Donker teaches:

- **an information processing unit comprising: a basic Web page**

   specify portion that receives an identifier of a basic Web page as a

   Web page to be a base of display and specifies the basic web page

   (column 1, lines 17-20, column 6, lines 5-11 & 31-34) (Donker teaches

   (column 5, lines 45-50) an URL for a webpage which serves as an

   identifier of a basic webpage.)

-        **a compared Web site specify portion that receives an identifier of a
         compared Web site as a compared object of the basic Web page
         and specifies the compared Web site** (Donker teaches (column 5,
         lines 45-50, column 6, lines 51-55) URL identifiers of webpages
         including both compared and similar web pages.)

-        **a keyword extract portion that extracts a keyword in the basic Web
         page specified by the basic Web page specify portion** (Donker
         teaches (column 6, lines 56-58) keywords associated with webpages.)

-        **a similar Web page finding portion that specifies one or multiple
         similar Web pages that are similar to an entire part or a part of the
         basic Web page in the compared Web sites based on the keyword
         extracted by the keyword extract portion** (Donker teaches (column 6,
         lines 51-61) locating similar web pages to a compared webpage based
         on keywords associated with both pages.)

As per Claim 14, Donker teaches:

-        **a Web page display control portion that displays the similar Web
         page specified by the similar Web page finding portion together
         with the basic Web page and synchronized with an operation to the
         basic Web page** (Donker teaches (column 2, lines 12-16) display of
         webpages.)

As per Claim 15, Donker teaches:

- **a content synchronization method of similar Web pages** (column 1, lines 17-20, column 6, lines 5-11 & 31-34) **comprising: a basic Web page specify step that receives an identifier of a basic Web page as a Web page to be a basis of display and specifies the basic Web page** (Donker teaches (column 5, lines 45-50) an URL for a webpage which serves as an identifier of a basic webpage.)

- **a compared Web site specify step that receives an identifier of a compared Web site as a Web page to be compared of the basic Web page and Specifies the compared Web page** (Donker teaches (column 5, lines 45-50, column 6, lines 51-55) URL identifiers of webpages including both compared and similar web pages.)

- **a keyword extract step that extracts a keyword in the basic Web page specified by the basic Web page specify step** (Donker teaches (column 6, lines 56-58) keywords associated with webpages.)

- **a similar Web page extract step that extracts one or multiple similar Web pages that are similar to an entire part or a part of the basic Web page in the compared Web sites based on the keyword extracted by the keyword extract step** (Donker teaches (column 6, lines 51-61) locating similar web pages to a compared webpage based on keywords associated with both pages.)

> - **a Web page display control step that displays the similar Web pages extracted by the similar Web page extract step together with the basic Web page simultaneously** (Donker teaches (column 2, lines 12-16) display of webpages.)

As per Claim 16, Donker teaches:

> - **a display mode of the similar Web page is controlled to synchronize with an operation to the basic Web page in the Web page display control step** (Donker teaches (column 2, lines 12-16) display of webpages.)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

13.   Claims 2-5 & 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Donker in view of Nagano et al. (US Patent No. 7,493,252 B1), hereinafter referred to as Nagano.

As per Claim 2, Donker does not explicitly disclose:

> - **a word frequency calculate portion that calculates frequency of a word in an entire or a part of a Web page and the keyword extract portion extracts a word whose frequency is not less than a**

predetermined threshold from words that appear in the basic Web page as the keyword

However, Nagano teaches:

- **a word frequency calculate portion that calculates frequency of a word in an entire or a part of a Web page and the keyword extract portion extracts a word whose frequency is not less than a predetermined threshold from words that appear in the basic Web page as the keyword** (Nagano teaches (column 2, lines 1-13) a word frequency calculator based upon extracted keywords and a determined threshold.)

- It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Nagano into the system of Donker. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to provide a method and system for automatically finding noteworthy webpages from a large amount of data by utilizing a word frequency calculator based upon keyword frequencies.

As per Claim 3, Donker does not explicitly disclose:

- **the word frequency calculate portion specifies a part of speech of each word by a Morphological analysis and calculates the word frequency by multiplying a number of each word appearance by a weight factor that has been previously determined**

However, Nagano teaches:

- **the word frequency calculate portion specifies a part of speech of each word by a Morphological analysis and calculates the word frequency by multiplying a number of each word appearance by a weight factor that has been previously determined** (Nagano teaches (column 2, lines 1-13, column 9, lines 60-67, column 10, lines 1-15) morphological analysis in conjunction with a word frequency calculator.)

- It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Nagano into the system of Donker. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to provide a method and system for automatically finding noteworthy webpages from a large amount of data by utilizing a word frequency calculator based upon keyword frequencies.

As per Claim 4, Donker does not explicitly disclose:

- **a Web page analyze portion that divides a title, a subtitle and a content sentence of a Web page by analyzing a structure of the Web page**

However, Nagano teaches:

- **a Web page analyze portion that divides a title, a subtitle and a content sentence of a Web page by analyzing a structure of the Web page** (Nagano teaches (column 2, lines 1-30, column 9, lines 60-

67, column 10, lines 1-15) morphological analysis in conjunction with a word frequency calculator.)

- It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Nagano into the system of Donker. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to provide a method and system for automatically finding noteworthy webpages from a large amount of data by utilizing a word frequency calculator based upon keyword frequencies.

As per Claim 5, Donker teaches:

- **the similar Web page finding portion searches a title and a subtitle of the compared Web page based on the subject keyword or searches a content sentence of the compared Web page based on the content keyword and extracts a similar Web page from a result of the above** (column 6, lines 51-61)

Donker does not explicitly disclose:

- **the keyword extract portion extracts a first keyword from words contained in the title and the subtitle and considers the first keyword as a subject keyword and also extracts a second keyword from words contained in the content sentence and considers the second keyword as a content keyword**

However, Nagano teaches:

- **the keyword extract portion extracts a first keyword from words contained in the title and the subtitle and considers the first keyword as a subject keyword and also extracts a second keyword from words contained in the content sentence and considers the second keyword as a content keyword** (Nagano teaches (column 2, lines 1-13, column 9, lines 60-67, column 10, lines 1-15) morphological analysis in conjunction with a word frequency calculator.)

- It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Nagano into the system of Donker. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to provide a method and system for automatically finding noteworthy webpages from a large amount of data by utilizing a word frequency calculator based upon keyword frequencies.

As per Claim 18, Donker does not explicitly disclose:

- **the word in <u>a first category</u> that is the same as the word that is selected in <u>a second category</u> is highlighted**

However, Nagano teaches:

- **the word in <u>a first category</u> that is the same as the word that is selected in <u>a second category</u> is highlighted** (Nagano teaches (column 10, lines 25-30) highlighting.)

- It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Nagano into the system

of Donker. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to provide

a method and system for automatically finding noteworthy webpages

from a large amount of data by utilizing a word frequency calculator

based upon keyword frequencies.

Allowable Subject Matter

14.   Claims 17 & 19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim,

but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of

the base claim and any intervening claims.

15.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to JOSHUA BULLOCK whose telephone number is

(571)270-1395. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30am-5pm EST M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John Breene can be reached on 571-272-4107. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Joshua Bullock/J. B. /
Examiner, Art Unit 2162
11/13/2009